

Promoting Integrated Landscape Management and Sustainable Food Systems in the Niger Delta Region in Nigeria

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10481

Countries

Nigeria

Project Name

Promoting Integrated Landscape Management and Sustainable Food Systems in the Niger Delta Region in Nigeria

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

6/18/2021

Review completed by PM

11/11/2021

Program Manager

Asha Bobb-Semple

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/11/2021

Cleared.

11/8/2021

Thank you for your response. We note that the project does make a contribution to climate change mitigation and so a RIO marker of '1' is more appropriate. Climate change mitigation is not the principal objective of the project based on the focus of the FOLUR program as a whole and given the stated objective of this child project. Please adjust the RIO marker to '1'.

7/2/2021:

Yes.

We note the RIO Marker for Mitigation is a 2. A '2' is only applicable if the project's principal objective is to contribute to climate change mitigation, otherwise a 1 is more suitable. Please consider and adjust accordingly.

Agency Response

Thanks. We selected 2 because the project does make a direct contribution to mitigation ? as also reflected in the core indicators (indicator 6) and FOLUR contribution requirements.

11/10/2021

Thanks, the RIO marker has been adjusted to 1.

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/5/2021:

Cleared.

7/2/2021:

Not fully.

Overall there is an opportunity to build on the interventions that go beyond the landscape level with the small holders and producers and expand to other actors and interventions along the value chain. Please see some comments below as well as under *Part II ? Project Justification, Question 3*.

1.Component 2

-The outputs mentioned largely reflect interventions related to training, enabling environment, capacity building. What are the field based actions that will be carried out to contribute to the expected target of 110,000 ha under SLM and the indicator listed on *Area under sustainable practices*. (Additional comments are provided under *question Part II ? Project Justification, Question 3*)

-Overall this component is strong on local action and smallholders? initiatives but could be strengthened on the linkage to larger initiatives related to cocoa and palm oil

production at the national or regional level and to take advantage of the opportunities that the global project will provide. Please consider how these aspects can be included.

-There is no mention of meeting sustainability requirements based on markets for sustainably produced commodities ? such as RSPO principles and criteria, or similar for cocoa. Please consider.

2.Component 4: Coordination with FOLUR is not reflected in the Outputs, but included as an indicator. Please include.

3. PMC Proportionality: Please increase the co-financing contribution to PMC, so that it is more proportional with the GEF contribution to PMC.

Agency Response

1) Component 2

- Field based actions will be carried out with the implementation of the capacity development program (output 2.1.2). This output consists of: establishing innovation platforms linking research-public & private extension-farmers (extending a public-private sector model used by IITA CocoaSoils Program) as engines for innovations that will continue beyond project duration; establishment of strategically located seed gardens and nurseries to improve the supply and quality of planting material to farmers (public investment co-financing from State Governments); and field trainings to accompany farmers in the implementation of sustainable cocoa and oil palm agroforestry systems (described in detail in Annex L ? what these entail and associated costs) through Farmer Field and Business Schools and other approaches used by FAO and GIZ Innovation Centre Initiative in Nigeria, and others. In this way, output 2.1.2 is more than traditional capacity building/training.

- We had further discussions with and received inputs from IDH, the Tropical Forest Alliance ? Africa Palm Oil Initiative in Edo State and other partners on this point. The linkage to larger initiatives (APOI, CFI) at national and regional level are reflected in the revised components 1 and 2. Please see also our response to Part II, question 3.

- Sustainability requirements have been incorporated in the outputs as recommended. Taken into consideration (Outputs revised accordingly).

2) Coordination with FOLUR now reflected in the outputs.

3) The ratio of PMC to co-finance is 1:12.9, and that of the overall project is 1:12.6. Slightly more co-financing for PMC.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/28/2021:

Cleared.

11/18/2021:

Please see follow up comments below:

- Central Bank of Nigeria: please change ?Public investment? to ?Loan?.
- Solidaridad: Source ? please change ?other? to ?Civil society organization?.

11/11/2021:

Noted.

11/8/2021:

Please see follow up comments below.

1. The figure in the IDH letter does not match the portal figure. Please amend. Please also double check the conversion to USD.
- 2.FAO entry in the portal should be investment mobilized rather than recurrent expenditures.

7/2/2021:

Not fully.

- 1.Please provide the co-financing letter from the Central Bank of Nigeria.

2. The letter from Solidaridad appears to indicate public investment and the portal indicates in kind. Please revise where appropriate. Additionally there is a category in the letter called *own reserves*. Please provide additional clarification on this in line with the GEF categories and indicate same in the letter.

3. The FAO letter does not indicate cash or in kind. Please revise to include the specific category.

4. We note there is no private sector co-financing. Will this be explored during project implementation? Is there a potential linkage with oil and gas companies who may have a direct physical presence and who have made commitments to landscape restoration, net zero ghg emissions and protection of biodiversity (Shell, Total, Chevron) which could potentially be large sources of co-finance, especially for Component 1 and Outcome 1.1.

Agency Response

11/19/2021:

Central Bank of Nigeria: ?Public investment? has been changed to ?Loan?.

Solidaridad: Source has been changed to ?Civil society organization?.

11/10/2021

1. The IDH letter has been revised. Co-financing amount of EUR 1,149,333 converted to USD using current UN conversion rate of \$1 = EUR 0.858.

2. FAO entry corrected to investment mobilized.

10/29/2021

1) CBN letter now attached.

2) Solidaridad letter revised ? this was an error.

3) FAO letter revised.

4) Yes, private sector co-financing will be concretized during implementation. The Foundation for Partnership Initiatives in the Niger Delta (PIND) is collaborating and is partly funded by one of the companies mentioned. PIND is a co-financing partner for the FOLUR project (see co-financing letter).

Please note that co-financing has increased with IDH's contribution.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/11/2021:

2. Cleared

3. Justification has been provided for the purchase of two vehicles including that the project target sites are in two different states Cross River State (2 million hectares) and Ondo State (1.5 million hectares) within the Niger Delta region, the national executing agency and local government bodies are already providing co-financing support in terms of seedlings and staff and the cost comparison with rental of vehicles makes this option least favorable. The purchase of the vehicles is cleared.

4. Cleared

11/5/2021:

1. Thank you. Cleared

2. As indicated previously the costs for the ESIA, Gender and Safeguards International Consultant and the National Gender Consultants are not eligible M&E expenses. The guidelines specifically refer to M&E plans related to these functions and not their entire role. The only costs that would be eligible are the specific M&E functions which they may perform under their TOR. We note that TORs have not been submitted for these consultants and so it is difficult to assess all of their functions. Assuming that they will be engaged in functions related to Gender, ESIA and Safeguards, please apply the cost portion of their tasks related to M&E under the M&E column and all other costs under a different section of the budget.

3. Thank you for the information provided and we note that co-financing is not available to assist with vehicle costs. To enhance the information provided and in order to document a more comprehensive justification, please include additional details on the cost comparison in terms of vehicle rental, how will the costs for maintenance be covered and the expanse of area to be covered by the vehicles.

4. Drivers regardless of their purpose are always assigned to PMC. Please make the amendment.

7/2/2021:

1. The cost for the National Project Coordinator is also covered under Component 4. All costs should be covered under the PMC.

2. The ESIA, Gender and safeguards International Consultant and the National Gender Consultants are not eligible M&E costs, please revise.

3. GEF does not usually cover motor vehicle costs, please provide a justification for these costs and/or explore coverage under co-financing for at least one of the vehicles.

4. Drivers should be covered under the PMC. Please adjust.

Agency Response

11/10/2021

2. In fact now looking at, for example, the gender action plan and responsibilities of the consultants, yes it makes sense that the costs are not reflected entirely under M&E.

Corrected.

3. An excel table with detailed cost comparison and distances has been uploaded. Rental = \$167,700 vs Buying = \$120,000. FRIN (executing agency) will cover the cost of fuel and maintenance.

4. Amendment made, thanks.

10/29/2021

1. The cost of the National Project Coordinator is included in component 4 because the person is expected to contribute to M&E (please see the ToRs). In any case we have now moved the cost to PMC.

2. According to the GEF guidelines and program cycle policy (2020) update, M&E of Gender, ESS Strategies, Stakeholder Engagement Plan, could be included under M&E budget (Table 3, page 18 of the guidelines), therefore we propose to reflect the costs here.

3. The two vehicles are proposed to support the implementation of component 3 ? restoration logistics, transfer of seedlings to the local government areas and technicians providing training on the ground. Seedlings and technicians are part of the Forestry Research Institute of Nigeria (FRIN) co-financing. An option would have been to hire

the vehicles instead, which would cost more than what is proposed in the budget. These are really essential.

4. The drivers are for the vehicles which are not for project management but are to support restoration logistics.

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/2/2021:

Yes

Agency Response
Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
11/8/2021:

Cleared

7/2/2021:

Not fully.

-Please provide additional explanation on how the targets are being accounted, including details on the categories of beneficiaries and an explanation of the emissions avoided/sequestered figures.

Agency Response
Further description of how the targets were derived now included. Thanks.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/8/2021:

Cleared.

7/2/2021:

Not fully.

Please include further information on the current context (challenges, opportunities) as it relates to other aspects of the value chain beyond the landscape level, the private sector and any existing linkages to regional or global commodity platforms.

Agency Response Further information has been included in the context, barriers and the baseline sections. Paragraphs 32-40; 61-62; 82-87.

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/8/2021:

Cleared.

7/2/2021:

Not fully.

-Very good initiatives are noted here, that can be built on for foster greater private sector engagement that can address the challenges identified in the challenges and barriers section of the ToC in diagram 10. However some are missing, notably the Cocoa Forests Initiative which is a key part of the overall FOLUR IP involving cocoa producing countries and RSPO for palm oil. Please include.

Agency Response Additional information has been incorporated ? Tropical Forest Alliance Africa Palm Oil Initiative (Nigeria participating) and RSPO activities, and World Cocoa Foundation initiatives. Paragraphs 82-87.

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/8/2021:

Cleared.

7/2/2021:

Thank you for a comprehensive description of the the project. Please see a couple of comments below.

1. Please see comments mentioned above under Table B.
2. A recommended action for Component 1 and Outputs 1.1 and 1.2 could include linkage with value chain actors to support the targeted investment amount of USD 200 million.
3. A recommended action for Component 2 and outcome 2.1 is linkage with major cocoa traders, brands and retailers and not to simply focus on the production side of the value chain. In addition to finance, these linkages can provide valuable technical assistance and knowledge resources (noted as an opportunity in paragraphs 47 and 48) to address the declining yields and improve environmental performance related to forest protection and the sustainable use of inputs, notably pesticides, fungicides in particular, and advanced plant nutrition.
4. Output 3.1.3- The activities listed don't refer to implementation of the strategy. Please clarify. Additionally this Output could also reference the potential revenue and investment from private sector sources and the opportunities to receive PES through carbon and NbS markets
5. Component 4- How is the engagement with the global project being used to make the linkages between then sustainable cocoa and palm oil production in Nigeria and the global markets and opportunities to scale approaches to other cocoa and palm oil producing countries in the region? Activity 2.1.2.1 is a good opportunity for the latter. Linkages through the initiatives in the Global Project, on these commodities should be explored to avoid duplication, efficiently share knowledge and widen the investment and interest of the global private sector actors.

Agency Response

- 1) Thanks
- 2) Outputs 1.1 and 1.2 have been revised to make the linkage with the private sector actors. An important element incorporated in output 1.1 (addressing this and related comments) is national level PPP frameworks of action that will link Nigeria to CFI and RSPO with IDH facilitation and FOLUR Global Platform.
- 3) Thanks. Recommendation addressed. Outputs revised. Please see in particular output 2.1.5.
- 4) Yes, implementation was missing. Included, thanks (activity 3.1.3.3).
- 5) Engagement with the global project is captured in activities 4.1.1.2 and 4.1.1.3. Also now reflected in activity 2.1.2.1 ? innovation platform linkage.

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/8/2021:

Cleared.

7/2/2021:

Not fully.

Please indicate how the project aligns with all of the components of the FOLUR program, paying specific attention to the FOLUR Program theory of change.

Agency Response Addressed. Alignment with FOLUR IP is further elaborated in 1c, pages 59-62.

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/8/2021:

Cleared.

7/2/2021:

Not fully.

Given the objective of the FOLUR program to not only focus on landscape level activities and actors, but to go beyond this to include interventions and actors along the entire value chain (in this case for coca and palm oil), please provide further information on the added value of the project in this regard. In addition, the narrative on the added value in terms of the linkages to the sustainable global cocoa value and supply chains needs to be strengthened.

Agency Response Indeed this aspect was weak and has now been strengthened. Section 1.5 revised.

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/2/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/2/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/2/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/8/2021:

Cleared.

7/2/2021:

Not fully.

Please provide specific details on how each component contributes to the FOLUR Program.

Agency Response Now included. Pages 59-62.

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/8/2021:

Cleared.

7/2/2021:

Yes.

1.However is there a role or involvement of stakeholders working on climate change in particular given the focus on resilience in the objective?

2.Please include the mode of engagement of the stakeholders mentioned.

Agency Response

1. Agro-climatological units/agencies within the State Ministries of Agriculture were consulted during project design and will be engaged in implementation, under component 2 output 2.1.2 (module on climate information services).

2. Included.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/8/2021:

Cleared.

7/2/2021:

Yes

-However, please consider the role of larger private sector actors in the Gender Action Plan. This is a area of key interest for the private sector (meeting SDG targets) and could form part of co-finance or other modalities of engagement such a private sector women's finance facilities.

Agency Response

This aspect, collaboration with the private sector to improve women's access to finance, has been included in the gender action plan (output 2.1.3).

There are quite a number of opportunities to unlock with National Banks ? for instance, the Bank of Industry Business Fund for Women, FarmerMoni, and Bank of Agriculture Grow and Earn More (GEM ? a specific product for women).

Further opportunities and co-finance from larger private sector companies will be explored and concretized during project implementation.

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/11/2021:

Cleared.

11/8/2021:

We note the revisions and improvements, specifically the stronger linkages with the major private sector cocoa and palm platforms and companies. During implementation, further consideration could be given to landscape actors in the resources sector who are most keen to invest in nature based solutions and have large financial capacity. This includes some of the oil and gas companies in the region.

7/2/2021:

Not fully.

-Overall there is a limited connectivity with large global private sector, PPP initiatives and larger cocoa and palm oil platforms through which assistance and finance could be better facilitated . A recommendation is to link with existing major cocoa and palm oil initiatives such as the Cocoa Forests Initiative and RSPO either through the World Bank global project management processes and/or directly through local producer groups and initiatives in country. IDH could assist in this regard.

Agency Response

11/10/2021

Recommendation taken ? appropriate text included below the co-financing table and in the ToR for the National Project Coordinator.

10/29/2021

Thanks for the recommendation. Private sector engagement has been clarified and strengthened (see revised Part II, 4, baseline initiatives and output 1.1.1 and sub-output on PPP Frameworks for Action, and other revised outputs). We went back and had further discussions with IDH, Tropical Forest Alliance Africa Palm Oil Initiative (link to RSPO), palm oil and cocoa associations and other partners for inputs on how best to engage the private sector (and the Government).

A side note on the current role of the private sector in cocoa and palm oil. Unlike in Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire (with dedicated coordinating entities e.g. Ghana Cocoa Board), the Government of Nigeria has had relatively minimal engagement in the regulation and coordination of these sectors. The private sector has taken the lead in many of the initiatives e.g. RSPO National Interpretation, and are enthusiastic to take part in Nigeria FOLUR. There is also commitment from the Government to take the lead, working with the private sector, in the project.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/11/2021:

Cleared

11/8/2021:

Please include climate change as a risk in the risk table and provide a summary of the mitigation measures.

7/2/2021:

Yes. Thank you for providing information from the climate risk screening. Please upload the document for reference.

Agency Response

11/10/2021

The risk has been summarized in the risk table.

10/29/2021

The document has been uploaded.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/11/2021:

The FAO execution functions to facilitate procurement and financial management and reporting related to the contracts are approved.

11/8/2021:

We note a new request for FAO execution support has been submitted. Please see questions below:

- Has FAO explored other organizations who can provide these execution functions?
- Please confirm which sub-executing organizations will have their contracts managed by FAO?
- What will be the functional reporting line of these sub-executing agencies?

7/2/2021:

Yes, thank you for the information on the institutional framework.

- 1.However we are unable to find the TORs for the key project staff in the supporting documentation. Please include.
- 2.Please also include the organizational chart from the project document in the portal submission.
3. It is not clear if the private sector has a role in the institutional arrangements- both at the national and state level. Please consider how they can be included in a substantive manner. There could be some consideration to invite private sector engagement at a key level to seek their buy-in, to gain advice and encourage collaboration on shared interests. The structure might also consider a private sector innovation group where the members of the private sector themselves can be encouraged to share new approaches, ways to support gender equity, facilitate finance and deploy technologies.

Agency Response

11/10/2021

Yes, FAO explored several options for over a year. Four government entities and WRI were identified as potential lead operational partners for the project:

1. Federal Ministry of Environment; Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development and Ministry of Finance, Budget and Planning. With these, there was an objection/caution from the GEF OFP due to past experience with issues concerning funds disbursement ? chains of bureaucracy delay fund disbursement within the ministries, which would pose a threat to timely project delivery.
2. World Resources Institute (WRI) indicated that while the work does fit well with their strategy and core competency (and they were engaged in the preparation of the original project concept), they would not directly engage in Nigeria as they have limited presence in the country.
3. CBN program management unit. This was proposed and agreed with the GEF OFP, taking into consideration CBN?s influence and convening power ? and given their

investments in cocoa and palm oil. The request to serve as executing agency was made to CBN. No timely response, therefore we could not move forward. (Actually delayed the assessment of FRIN as CBN seemed an ideal option).

The entities proposed to have contracts managed by FAO in year 1-2, while FRIN puts in place policies and procedures for managing sub-contracts, include: IDH, Solidaridad, Foundation for Partnership Initiatives in the Niger Delta (PIND), State REDD+ Units.

Regarding the functional reporting of the sub-executing agencies, it is essential that the project is coordinated as a whole. As such, while the executing entities will be reporting to FAO on use of funds, there will be a provision in the agreements linking their reporting to the Project Management Unit to be established by FRIN.

10/29/2021

1. ToRs of key project staff now included in Annex O.
2. We tried to upload the chart in the portal in the first submission, it did not allow us to.
3. The project preparation team had several discussions with the private sector ? bilaterally and through the World Cocoa Foundation (for cocoa) and with IDH. They provided key inputs that have shaped the project design. They expressed their intention to play a key role in the project. This will be through:
 - National Project Steering Committee membership will include representatives from the Cocoa Association of Nigeria (CAN) and the Oil Palm Growers Association of Nigeria (OPGAN ? which currently holds about 80% of the oil palm market share), platforms that bring together all cocoa and oil palm value chain actors in Nigeria.
 - State-level Technical Committee membership, where in addition to the cocoa and oil palm associations, WCF participation is proposed.
 - Multi-stakeholder platforms to be strengthened and/or established, including state-level innovation platforms (activity 2.1.2.1 - modeled on the national cocoa soils program multi-stakeholder innovation platform).

Please see also the revised section on private sector engagement.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/2/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/8/2021:

Cleared.

7/2/2021:

Not fully.

Please indicate how the project will build on knowledge from previous projects.

Agency Response Additional information on lessons learned and knowledge from previous projects incorporated in the design is now included ? knowledge management section paragraph 171.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/2/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/2/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/8/2021

Cleared.

7/2/2021:

No. Please insert the budget table in Annex E

Agency Response Inserted.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/11/2021:

Cleared.

11/8/2021

Thank you.

We see where the targets under sub-indicator 3.2 have been assigned- i.e. under Component 3. Please also assign the targets for sub-indicators 3.1 and 4.3.

7/2/2021:

-Please insert the results framework in the portal submission.

Agency Response

11/10/2021

Targets included.

Inserted.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/8/2021:

Cleared.

7/2/2021:

Please include responses to the additional comments provided by council member from France available [here](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/work-program-documents/GEF_C.57_compilation_council_comments.pdf) https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/work-program-documents/GEF_C.57_compilation_council_comments.pdf

Agency Response Included, thanks.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/8/2021:

Cleared.

7/2/2021:

Please also provide responses to relevant STAP comments on the PFD available here https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/web-documents/10201_STAP_Screen.pdf

Agency Response Responses to relevant STAP comments included.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/2/2021:

Yes

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/2/2021:

Yes

Agency Response
Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/28/2021:

All follow up comments have been addressed. The project is cleared and recommended for CEO Endorsement.

11/18/2021:

Not at this time. Please address the follow up comments on the co-financing.

11/11/2021:

The project is cleared and recommended for CEO Endorsement.

11/8/2021:

Not at this time. Please address the follow up comments above.

7/2/2021:

Not at this time. Please address the comments above.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review	7/2/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/8/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/11/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/18/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/28/2021

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations